arXiv:1612.08671v1 [cond-mat.soft] 27 Dec 2016

Comment on "Crossover of collective modes and positive sound dispersion in supercritical state"

T. Bryk[1,2], I. Mryglod[1]

[1] *Institute for Condensed Matter Physics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 1 Svientsitskii Street, UA-79011 Lviv, Ukraine*

[2] *Institute of Applied Mathematics and Fundamental Sciences, Lviv Polytechnic National University, UA-79013 Lviv, Ukraine*

(Dated: December 28, 2016)

Abstract

We comment on an expression for positive sound dispersion (PSD) in fluids and analysis of PSD from molecular dynamics simulations reported in the Letter by Fomin *et al* (J.Phys.:Condens.Matt. v.28, 43LT01, 2016)

In a recent Letter[1] the authors promoted their own idea of a "Frenkel line", which has to separate liquid-like and gas-like fluids in supercritical region, and took as a case study the behaviour of positive sound dispersion in fluids. The same group of authors in fact extended a sequence of their exotic claims, which contains: a "damping myth" [2, 3], a model of non-damped excitations applied to acoustic modes and non-hydrodynamic shear waves in fluids[4], a "liquid-gas transition in the supercritical region" along a line which crosses the coexistence line below (!) critical temperature [5], etc. As a matter of fact there is no rigorous theoretical basis for the concept of the "Frenkel line" starting from the basic principles of statistical theory of many-particle systems. Therefore the theory has been simply replaced by speculations, and a good example of these speculations is right the Letter [1], in which the authors claimed that they derived an expression for positive sound dispersion (PSD) in fluids. The observed positive sound dispersion, which is a consequence of viscoelasticity and damping effects in liquds, was studied for many years and at least three explanations exist for this phenomenon on the basis of mode-coupling theory [6], of memory function (MF) approch [7] and of generalized collective modes (GCM)[8]. In contrast to the existing theories of PSD the reported expression in [1] was not obtained within some theoretical approach, but it connects PSD with the existence of shear waves (transverse excitations) and was used to explain a dynamic crossover between liquid-like and gas-like fluids in supercritical region. We show here that the expression for the apparent speed of sound v_l in liquids reported in [1]

$$v_l^2 = c_s^2 + 4/3 v_t^2 \ , \tag{1}$$

where c_s and v_t are respectively hydrodynamic (macroscopic) speed of sound and apparent speed of transverse excitations, is a consequence of several mistakes and wrong approximations.

(i). Usually in order to study PSD within some theoretical scheme one needs to obtain analytical expression for dispersion of longitudinal collective excitations beyond the hydrodynamic region as a function of wave number $\omega(k)$. Then the mechanism of PSD as a deviation from the hydrodynamic dispersion law can be estimated. Fomin *et al*, however, did not try to derive any theoretical dispersion law $\omega(k)$ but started from an expression for macroscopic (at $k \to 0$) elastic speeds of longitudinal and transverse sound in solids. Making

use of

$$\sqrt{\frac{B+4/3G}{\rho}} \tag{2}$$

for the high-frequency speed of longitudinal sound in liquids, where B and G are respectively bulk and shear moduli in elastic medium, and identifying the presence of G in expression (2) with the effect of shear waves on the longitudinal speed of sound - it is nearly the same as to make a senseless claim that the speed of longitudinal phonons in crystals depends on the transverse phonons. We would like to remind, that for the case of non-molecular liquids all the static and time-dependent cross-correlations between longitudinal and transverse currents as well as between the corresponding components of stress tensor are equal to zero;

(ii). The *apparent* speed of sound in liquids estimated either from scattering experiments or computer simulations is not (2) as it is stated in [1]. In fact, all the observed peak frequencies in experiments or simulations correspond to damped collective excitations and one must account for damping effects. The propagation speed (2) is obtained from theory in solely *elastic* approximation when the coupling with density and heat fluctuations is neglected [9], that results in dispersion of non-damped (bare) high-frequency excitations, which goes at higher frequencies than the observed ones in MD simulations or in scattering experiments;

(iii). In order to modify the high-frequency dispersion with the propagation speed (2) and to account for the hydrodynamic dispersion a trick was suggested in [1], which consists in replacement of the high-frequency bulk modulus B_∞ of the elastic regime by the macroscopic zero-frequency one B_0 of the viscous regime. Such an approximation does not have any sense - the high-frequency bulk modulus B_∞ is defined via the microscopic forces acting on particles [10]

$$B_\infty = \frac{2nk_BT}{3} + P + \frac{2\pi n^2}{9}\int_0^\infty dr g(r) r^3 \frac{d}{dr}[r\frac{dV(r)}{dr}] \ , \tag{3}$$

while B_0 is connected solely with the macroscopic isothermal compressibility of the system

$$B_0 = \frac{nk_BT}{S(k\to 0)} \equiv \frac{nk_BT}{1+4\pi n\int_0^\infty dr[g(r)-1]r^2} \ , \tag{4}$$

i.e. it is impossible to reduce the expression for B_∞ [10] to B_0 by any reasonable approximation. In (3) n, k_B, T, P, $g(r)$, $V(r)$ are respectively the number density, Boltzmann constant, temperature, pressure, pair distribution function and effective interatomic pair potential;

(iv). Only one of the two high-frequency quantities in (2) was replaced by its zero-frequency macroscopic value, i.e. only the bulk modulus in elastic regime was substituted by macroscopic bulk modulus of the viscous regime, while the shear modulus in (2) remained in the elastic regime. In order to be consistent Fomin *et al* had to apply the same approximation both to B_∞ and G_∞. Immediately they would see the validity of the approximation they were using, because $G_0 \equiv 0$ for liquids and the resulting expression will be senseless;

(v). In order to have a reference speed of sound, which for estimation of the positive sound dispersion must be the macroscopic adiabatic speed of sound c_s, an expression

$$c_s = \sqrt{\frac{B_0}{\rho}} \tag{5}$$

was used in [1], in which the ratio of specific heats γ is missing in numerator under the square root, that results in isothermal and not in adiabatic speed of sound, i.e. absolutely other reference speed of sound which cannot be used for estimation of PSD. In case the authors of [1] may argue that the zero-frequency bulk modulus obtained from the proposed substitution $B(\omega) = B_0$ is the adiabatic one, then this is nothing else but a misleading manipulation with quantities made in [1], because it is impossible to reduce a high-frequency *elastic* quantity to the *adiabatic* one. We would like to remind the readers, that the adiabatic propagation is the consequence of the coupling of the isothermal macroscopic propagation to heat fluctuations - it cannot be obtained by any approximation from the high-frequency bulk modulus. And the ratio of specific heats γ is right a measure of coupling between the heat fluctuations and viscous processes;

(vi). The reported in [1] expression for the apparent speed of sound (1) implies that the positive sound dispersion will be observed only for wave numbers for which the shear waves can propagate in liquid. This immediately leads to very strange dispersion of collective excitations which contains a kink at k_{sw}, where k_{sw} is the width of the propgation gap for shear waves, i.e. the smallest wave number at which shear waves (transverse excitations) can be observed. For $k < k_{sw}$ the dispersion of longitudinal excitations according to (1) is solely hydrodynamic one, while at k_{sw} the dispersion changes its slope, that has never been observed either from scattering experiments or from computer simulations. A simple example can be the dispersion of collective excitations in the simplest fluids of hard spheres or 2D hard disks. For 2D hard disk fluids in a wide range of packing fractions the non-hydrodynamic trasverse excitations were observed[11] while there was no evidence found for

positive sound dispersion - only "negative" dispersion with respect to the hydrodynamic dispersion law was observed. This fact contradicts the suggested by Fomin *et al* relation between the positive sound dispersion and transverse excitations.

In their Fig.2 Fomin *et al* reported dispersion curves for three densities of Lennard-Jones fluid, obtained from peak positions of longitudinal (L) and transverse (T) current spectral functions $C^{L/T}(k,\omega)$ derived from molecular dynamics (MD) simulations. In order to be consistent with their "Frenkel line" idea of dynamic crossover they claim that above the "Frenkel line" (for lower densities, open stars in their Fig.1) the positive sound dispersion and transverse excitations disappear, that is clearly not the case as one can clearly observe in their Fig.2. Moreover, the excess of the apparent speed of sound over the hydrodynamic one (very similar positive sound dispersion as in Figs.2a and 2b) namely for low-density fluids was reported in [12] from MD simulations of supercritical Ar at four different temperatures, i.e. for about 30 thermodynamic points of low-density Ar. Therefore, it is not clear why Fomin *et al* claim that there is no PSD for low-density states in contradiction to their Figs.2a and 2b and to the results of [12]. Furthermore, in their Fig.2c the dispersion curves were reported for 12 wave numbers, proportional to some minimal value less than 0.1Å^{-1}. This is in contradiction to the reported in Table 1 value $k_{min} = 0.11887\text{Å}^{-1}$ that implies wrong sampling of wave numbers, which are not consistent with the periodicity of MD box.

Another issue is connected with a comparison of "direct" numerical estimation of dispersion and GCM results. The used in [1] "direct" estimation of the dispersion curves from peak positions of $C^{L/T}(k,\omega)$ is the most simple and not really precise one. In fact, the shape of $C^{L/T}(k,\omega)$ in that "direct" approach is solely ascribed to respectively L/T collective excitations and neglects contributions coming from other propagating and relaxing processes. More precise approaches take into account contributions from different relaxation processes and coupling of L and T currents with them - one uses either a fit within the memory function approach [7], fit-free GCM approach [8, 13, 14], or a combination of a fit with GCM methodology[20, 21]. The GCM approach [15–18] is able to separate contributions from different collective relaxing and propagating modes and simultaneously satisfies any required level of exact sum rules. The quality of the GCM approach for description of time correlation functions and corresponding spectral functions was shown many times [19–21] - therefore it is strange that Fomin *et al* claim that the numerical estimation of dispersion from peak positions of $C^{L/T}(k,\omega)$ is superior to the GCM approach. It is known for long

time that the stronger the contribution from relaxation processes (like for low-density fluids with essentially different from unity ratio of specific heats γ, or for dense fluids in the region of de Gennes slowing down of density fluctuaions) the larger will be the deviation of the observed peak position of $C^L(k,\omega)$ from the real frequency of collective excitation. It seems Fomin *et al* do not realise that the L-dispersion curves estimated from the observed peaks of MD-derived either dynamic structure factors $S(k,\omega)$, or imaginary part of dynamic susceptibility $\chi^{''}(k,\omega)$, or L-current spectral function $C^L(k,\omega)$ will be different, while the corresponding frequencies from the GCM analysis of these three spectral functions will be identical as it must be. Concerning the other strange claims of Fomin *et al* on the choice of dynamic variables and sum rules in GCM approach we refer the readers to our extended Comment[22].

[1] Yu.D. Fomin, V.N. Ryzhov, E.N. Tsiok, V.V. Brazhkin, K. Trachenko, J.Phys.:Condens.Matt. **28**, 43LT01 (2016)

[2] V.V. Brazhkin, K. Trachenko, J.Phys.Chem. B. **118**, 11417 (2015)

[3] V.V. Brazhkin, K. Trachenko, J.Non-Cryst. Sol. **407**, 149 (2015)

[4] D. Bolmatov, V. V. Brazhkin, K. Trachenko, Sci. Rep. **2**, 421 (2012)

[5] V.V. Brazhkin, Yu.D. Fomin, A.G. Lyapin, V.N. Ryzhov, E.N. Tsiok, and K. Trachenko, Phys.Rev.Lett. **111**, 145901 (2013).

[6] M.H. Ernst, J.R. Dorfman, J.Stat.Phys., **12**, 311 (1975)

[7] T. Scopigno, U. Balucani, G. Ruocco, F. Sette, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter, **12**, 8009 (2000)

[8] T. Bryk, I. Mryglod, T. Scopigno, G. Ruocco, F. Gorelli, M. Santoro, J.Chem.Phys. **133**, 024502 (2010).

[9] T. Bryk, I. Mryglod, Condens. Matter Phys. **1**1, 139 (2008).

[10] J.-P. Boon, S. Yip, *Molecular Hydrodynamics* (New-York: McGraw-Hill) (1980).

[11] A. Huerta, T. Bryk, A. Trokhymchuk, J.Coll. Interf. Sci. **449**, 357 (2015).

[12] F.A. Gorelli, T. Bryk, M. Krisch, G.Ruocco, M.Santoro and T. Scopigno, Sci. Rep. **3**, 1203 (2013).

[13] I.M. Mryglod, I.P. Omelyan, M.V.Tokarchuk, Mol. Phys. **84** 235 (1995).

[14] T. Bryk, I. Mryglod, Phys. Rev. E **63**, 051202 (2001).

[15] T. Keyes, D. Kivelson, J. Chem. Phys. **54**, 1786 (1971).

[16] D. Kivelson, T.Keyes, J. Chem. Phys. **57**, 4599 (1972).

[17] I.M. deSchepper, E.G.D. Cohen, C. Bruin, J.C. van Rijs, W. Montfrooij, and L.A. de Graaf, Phys. Rev. A **38**, 271 (1988).

[18] I.M. Mryglod, Condens. Matter Phys. **1** 753 (1998).

[19] T. Bryk, I. Mryglod, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 032202 (2001).

[20] T. Bryk, G. Ruocco, Mol.Phys. **111**, 3457 (2013).

[21] T. Bryk, J.-F. Wax, J. Chem. Phys. **144**, 194501 (2016).

[22] T. Bryk, I. Mryglod, ArXiv preprint, arXiv:1510.07093 (2015).